

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C.7150 E. CAMELBACK, SUITE 325
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251Telephone: (480) 385-5060
Facsimile: (480) 385-5061RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
DEC 27 2006**FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET**

TO:	FROM:
Examiner: J. D. Popham	Paul D. Amrozowicz, Reg. No. 45,264
COMPANY:	DATE:
USPTO	DECEMBER 27, 2006
FAX NUMBER:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
571 273-8300	4
PHONE NUMBER:	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:
	044.0019
RE:	RECIPIENTS REFERENCE NUMBER:
Response	09/911,149

URGENT FOR REVIEW PLEASE COMMENT PLEASE REPLY PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

**FORMAL COMMUNICATION
INTENDED FOR ENTRY**

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED, AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAWS. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

5

In re application of: Chad W. MERCER et al. Group Art Unit: 2137
Serial No.: 09/911,149 Examiner: J. D. Popham
Filed: July 23, 2001 Confirmation No.: 4485

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
DEC 27 2006**

10 For: METHOD FOR ESTABLISHING A SECURITY ASSOCIATION BETWEEN
TWO OR MORE COMPUTERS COMMUNICATING VIA AN
INTERCONNECTED COMPUTER NETWORK

Docket No.: 044.0019

15 Customer No. : 29906

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (571) 273-8300.

on December 27, 2006.

Signature:

Paul D. Amozowicz

REPLY BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.41

20

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

25

Sir:

This is a Reply Brief pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.41 in response to an Examiner's Answer mailed November 27, 2006. Each of the topics in the Examiner's Answer for which a response is supplied herein are indicated using appropriate subheadings on the following pages. This 30 Reply Brief does not include any new or non-admitted amendment, or any new or non-admitted affidavit or other evidence. As such, Appellant submits it is in full compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 41.41(a).

I. THE EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT SECTION MISTATES
WHAT IS DICLOSED IN CARMEN ET AL., AND IMPLIES A
PROPOSITION THAT IS NOT SUPPORTED BY STATUTE OR CASE LAW

5 In the "Response to Argument" section of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner states
that Carmen et al. teaches that "the SPI is the *sole* value used to access the SAD into order to
store and retrieve the appropriate SA," and cites col. 17, l. 51 to col. 18, l. 56 to support this
allegation. See Examiner's Answer at 8 (emphasis added). However, this statement completely
mischaracterizes what Carmen et al. discloses. Rather, what Carmen et al. explicitly states is that
10 "[t]he retrieved SPI is then used to access the SAD to retrieve the appropriate authentication gear
information." Nowhere does Carmen et al. disclose, or even remotely suggest, that the SPI is the
sole value used to access the SAD, and to allege that it does is simply disingenuous. As
Appellant noted in its Appeal Brief, the skilled artisan, upon reading such generalized statements
associated with how the SPI is used, would only conclude that the teaching refers to what was
15 generally known in the art at the time the inventors invented the instant invention. Without the
luxury of Appellants' own disclosure a skilled artisan would not have even considered the
generalized teaching of "using" the SPI to access the SAD to mean that the SPI is the specific
address value in the SAD at which the associated SA is stored.

In addition to the above, the Examiner further states that because Carman et al. "does not
20 teach any hashing of the SPI value when using the SPI to access the SAD and store/retrieve the
SA, or using any other value together with the SPI for accessing the SAD, he does teach
assigning the specific memory address value as an SPI associated with the received SA data
structure." See Examiner's Answer at 8-9. Thus, it is apparently the Examiner's understanding
that if a prior art reference does not explicitly teach what is conventionally known in the prior art
25 or what is claimed in an application being examined, then one is free to use the reference as a
basis for asserting that it discloses anything whatsoever, including what is claimed in the
application being examined. As the Board may no doubt appreciate, such a proposition is not
supported by any statute or case law.

II. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Appellant once again submits that the final rejection of 1-8 and 36 is improper and should not be sustained. Appellant also repeats its earlier request for a reversal of the rejections in the final Office action dated August 5, 2005.

5

Respectfully submitted,

Paul D. Amrozowicz
Registration No. 45,264

10

Dated December 27, 2006